

17388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 23, 1965

ing stentorian harmonies. Once again the orchestra demonstrated great virtuosity with its precision of ensemble, its delicate maneuvering from one solo instrument to another or to the full complement of players as Conductor Martinon deftly recreated the score.

THUNDEROUS APPLAUSE

Accorded a thunderous, standing ovation by the audience, the orchestra responded with the bombastic "Rakoczy March" by Hector Berlioz. Still reluctant to accept the end of a thrilling evening, the audience kept Conductor Martinon returning for repeated acknowledgements.

Tonight, the symphony promises an equally exciting evening with Associate Conductor Irwin Hoffman conducting a program including Schubert's "Symphony No. 5," the "Harry Janos Suite" by the contemporary Composer Zoltan Kodaly, and the Brahms "Symphony No. 2." Hoffman, a protege of the late Serge Koussevitzky, was formerly conductor of the Vancouver, British Columbia Symphony and has appeared as guest conductor of leading orchestras throughout the United States, Mexico, and South America.

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1965]

CHICAGO SYMPHONY CHEERED IN ALASKA

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, May 26.—Monday evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Lathrop High School auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area, it was a memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra to present a concert in the farthest north city.

With precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of the chief work, Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset the acoustics of the Lathrop stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of the brook.

Accorded a standing ovation, the orchestra responded with the "Rakoczy March" by Berlioz.

At the end of the concert the audience made Mr. Martinon return for repeated acknowledgements.

The symphony played again Tuesday night before going on to Winnipeg, Manitoba, for another concert.

THE 14(b) ISSUE—RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is before the Senate in S. 256 and action is imminent in the House on the companion bill, H.R. 77, which was reported favorably on June 22.

Over the years, the right-to-work question surrounding the issue has drawn forth literally millions of words, engendered bitter feelings, caused the expenditure of untold sums of money by those who contend for and against, and shaken the entire electorate in such States as Ohio and California when the issue appeared on the ballot there. Advocates and proponents are to be found in this body, and we can look forward to strong expressions of differing views before the roll is called on the repeal bill.

I support the bill for repeal. I have sought to look at the question rationally

rather than emotionally, and I have come to my conclusion as a result of the persuasiveness of the facts surrounding the situation.

On Monday of this week, Hobart Rowan, of the Washington Post, examined the question in his column appearing on the business page of that paper. His article is penetrating, and as a business editor his views are worthy of attention. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ECONOMIC IMPACT: SMOKESCREENS OBSCURE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

(By Hobart Rowan)

The battle over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—those unfortunate few words that allow an individual State to ban the union shop—is about to be resumed, this time on the House floor. The public will thus be treated again to an appalling amount of hokum and buncombe on this issue.

Those individuals and organizations that want to preserve the right-to-work laws permitted by section 14(b) ought to quit shadowboxing, and say forthrightly that they're against the whole idea of labor unions.

Right or wrong, at least that position would end the pretense that they are losing valuable sleep over the question of individual liberty.

At the present time, 19 States have taken advantage of section 14(b) by prohibiting any agreement between an employer and a union specifying membership in a union as a condition of employment. Even if a company and a union should desire a union shop, it would be illegal in these 19 States.

But while the chamber of commerce and others weep crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the other 31 States, the basic motive of the right-to-work crowd is to attract industry with the promise of cheap, nonunion labor.

And as the AFL-CIO has ably documented, the less respectable of the antiunion band have a close alliance with the ultraright-wing John Birch types, whose bias on this score is merely one aspect of a longer record of antiquated, antisocial, 19th century prejudices.

Organizations like the chamber, which are eminently respectable, if behind the times, fail to see the inconsistency between their avowed support of the principle of collective bargaining and their demand for continuance of section 14(b).

They are saying, in effect, that an employer should have to bargain with his workers (that's what collective bargaining means)—provided they haven't formed an effective union. If one can make sense out of the chamber position, it is that employers should strive to return to that nostalgic era when they could deal with their employees individually.

Well, maybe it would be nice—the way some people look at it—to do without unions. But the chamber better forget it, and take a look at the calendar. It is 1965.

Most of the really influential leaders of American industry have taken a more sophisticated approach. They know that the "individual freedom" propaganda is just that—a line created by the same imaginative public relations men who thought up the misleading right-to-work phrase.

Actually, the real leaders of American industry couldn't care less about repeal of section 14(b). Some, it is true, wish that President Johnson had staved off AFL-CIO president George Meany's request. But policymakers in the U.S. business community deal regularly with unions and the union shop.

By and large, they'd be panicked if they

weren't assured of well-organized, responsible labor unions to provide a steady flow of manpower for them.

One of L.B.J.'s Texas aids confides: "When a big national company comes in down home, they generally ask: 'Where's the union?' If it's not there, they're disappointed. They want one right on tap."

But the local wheels are generally nervous. They are skeptical of union organizers, who are equated to invaders, men who want to upend precious States rights. Above all, the local men, often pillars of small-time chambers of commerce, feel they can keep wages low if the union is kept out. They freely advertise and solicit on that basis.

The unions have floated their share of baloney, too. Repeal of section 14(b) is not a do-or-die proposition for union organization, because they can and do survive in the right-to-work States.

And despite denials, it is true that the notion of a union shop involves a certain element of compulsion. This ought to be freely admitted, because the compulsion is justifiable. Where collective bargaining is the law of the land, a man who is deriving benefits from union representation ought to join the union. At least, he ought to pay dues, which is all the law requires.

The unions want to do away with section 14(b) because it is a bone in the throat. The Wagner Act established the principle of collective bargaining, and then the Taft-Hartley Act partially reneged. For 18 years this has invited antiunion harassment. Both management and labor could turn their attention to more useful and productive endeavors if section 14(b) were scrapped.

RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am glad to have been a cosponsor of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, which Senator Ribicoff introduced last February and in which 67 Members joined him. That resolution expressed the sense of the Congress, in part, that "the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

The Senate passed that resolution by a unanimous rollcall vote on May 14, and it was passed by the House with amendment last week, on July 12.

The importance of this resolution, and the indisputable facts which called it forth, are underlined by an article appearing in the current issue of the noted nondenominational religious journal, the Christian Century. Under the title "Cultural Genocide in Russia," its former editor, Dr. Harold Fey, now a professor of social ethics at the Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis, discusses the extent of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. He warns that success of the efforts being made against the Jewish faith in "an officially atheistic state" "will have demonstrated that it has perfected a pattern of cultural genocide which can be used against other religions when their turn comes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17387

without it for more than 175 years and could still do so.

This argument advanced by L. T. Skiffington could be made with equal force against any governmental reform at any time. It could be made with equal force against the act giving statehood to Colorado. It is an essentially unenlightened plea for the status quo with no regard for the changed conditions which have made improvement of our machinery of government imperative. Indeed, the premise on which the argument is based is itself a betrayal of ignorance. The country passed through perilous times while President Garfield and later President Wilson were stricken and could not be temporarily relieved of their onerous duties because of the existing defect in the Constitution. On many occasions the country has been only one heartbeat away from potential chaos because of the absence of any mechanism for replacing the Vice President.

It is rather shocking to note such complete unawareness of the problems of Presidential succession and disability as that manifested in Denver. Fortunately, three other States—Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Oklahoma—hastened to ratify the proposed 25th amendment. We have no doubt that 35 additional States will complete the ratification process. In the end, Colorado may wish to erase the negative distinction it has acquired by a minority response to any argument based on blind reaction.

A CHALLENGE TO EXTREMISTS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Columnist Max Freedman has paid the State controller of California, Alan Cranston, a much deserved tribute in the Washington Evening Star for Thursday.

Mr. Cranston, Freedman notes, has spoken out importantly about extremists in his State, expressing the view which none can challenge that the extremist makes his greatest gains when moderate, responsible people remain silent or act timidly. And he makes the very valid point that extremists, whether of the left or right, are one of a kind, really. The point is well made by Cranston, and by Freedman in his column, that both types of extremists are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process, though the rightwing variety enjoys a fundamental advantage in that many Americans honestly believe they are defending American ideals and freedoms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's column, "Californian Challenges Extremists," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 22, 1965]

CALIFORNIAN CHALLENGES EXTREMISTS (By Max Freedman)

It could not have been easy for State Controller Alan Cranston to make his recent important speech on extremist groups in California. Had someone from outside California spoken in these harsh and challenging terms, he would have been charged with maligning the State as a paradise for extremists. Cranston accepted that risk because he believes that the extremists make their greatest gains when the moderate and responsible people are silent or timid.

What fails to emerge from Cranston's

analysis, otherwise so admirable, is an explanation of why California should be so open to the appeal of the extremists. Their supporters are found among young people as well as among the old and the retired taking counsel from their frightened prejudices. We must apparently reconcile ourselves to the curious fact that the liberal and progressive traditions of California are crossed by a more raucous and extreme strain.

Cranston begins by citing documentary proof that the Communists and the John Birchers often say the same thing. For example, the monthly magazine published by the leftwing Progressive Labor Party charges that President Kennedy was assassinated on orders from big business. The John Birch Society claims that Kennedy was killed because he was not a good enough Communist. Both denounce President Johnson and Walter Reuther as conspirators afraid to avow their real purposes or to disclose their real masters. Both denounce the American press as an organized conspiracy against the truth.

The major difference between the leftwingers and the John Birchers is that one group thinks the United States is headed toward fascism and the other claims the United States is moving toward communism. It is not much of a difference for people who believe in freedom.

Cranston cited evidence that 3,000 groups in the United States are now spending \$30 million a year promoting rightwing extremism. Last year the John Birch Society alone spent an estimated \$3 million and is now planning to add 38,000 new members in California. Robert Welch, the society's president, devotes about half his time to enlarging the California membership.

Another rightwing extremist, Carl McIntire, a deposed Presbyterian minister now conducting a disreputable anti-Catholic radio campaign, grossed an estimated \$1.5 million in 1964.

Welch has said, "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."

The one thing common to all extremist groups is their inflexible conviction that they are right and their opponents are evil. Acting on this principle, they are no longer open to reason, no longer willing to respect the wishes of the majority. What makes them dangerous is neither their ugly political technique nor their contempt for the facts. They are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process itself. They create a climate of fear so that their doctrines of hate may prevail. The vicious personal attack on the reputation of Senator THOMAS KUCHER, Republican, of California, an attack to which he responded with rare courage, is only one example of the evil weapons they will use against a public man of whom they disapprove.

Yet the rightwing groups, as Cranston has shown, enjoy one vast advantage always denied to the Communists. Many Americans do honestly believe that these extreme rightwingers are defending American ideals and values. They see them owing no foreign allegiance and parading their claims as super-patriots. If the rightwingers are rough with their opponents, it is a roughness justified by the cause being served. That is the basic appeal of the extremists, in California as elsewhere. Yet the warning by the Los Angeles Times is profoundly true that subversion remains subversion whether it comes from the right or the left.

The extremists probably have made life a misery for Cranston since he denounced them. But other public officials will no doubt follow his courageous example. A concerted exposure of the false assumptions and dangerous methods of the extremist groups is the best way to discredit them utterly.

CHICAGO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA SUCCESS IN ALASKA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra enjoys an international reputation for excellence. I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the overwhelming success it enjoyed at Fairbanks, Alaska. This was the first event in which a major orchestra had appeared in the city, and I am glad to read that thunderous applause acclaimed the performance.

I ask that the articles from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner and New York Times be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 25, 1965]

FIRST MAJOR CONCERT THRILLS FAIRBANKS, SYMPHONY LAUDED

(By Prof. Charles Davis, head, music department, University of Alaska)

Last evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Hering Auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area it was a truly memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by the internationally known Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra ever to present a concert in the farthest North city.

With meticulous precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset, the vagaries of the acoustics of the Hering stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting to the situation, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of "the Brook."

DELICACY OF LINE

In opening an orchestral program with the "Pastoral" the first two movements in their predominantly restrained dynamics seem somewhat overlong. This reviewer might have preferred a degree of anticipation in the "Andante Molto Moto," as the tempo seemed to suggest too great a degree of repose. The serenity of this second movement was characterized by great delicacy of line and phrasing.

Certainly the third movement of the symphony is a welcome change of mood, with its Ländler dance rhythm. From this movement the heightened tension builds to its ultimate climax in the "storm." Here the instruments combined with a sonority of tone that overwhelms, still maintaining an exactness and balance characteristic of great ensemble playing. The final Allegretto was a consummate portrayal of joy and peace.

Following the intermission, the orchestra turned to a composition in a contemporary idiom—"Orchestra Variation on a Theme of Paganini"—by Blacher. Announced by solo violin in its original form, the theme, disguised and altered, moves to various sections of the orchestra with accompaniments in widely contrasting rhythm and sonorities. The complexities of rhythm combined with a modern harmonic usage create highly entertaining program fare.

Concluding the program was the familiar tone poem "Don Juan" by Richard Strauss. This composition, typical of the early Strauss writing, exploits all sections of the orchestra in intricate melodic motifs and contrast-

July 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17389

CULTURAL GENOCIDE IN RUSSIA

(NOTE.—By measures threatening the continuance of Jews as members of a religious entity, the Soviet Union courts designation abroad as champion of that anti-Semitism it once abhorred.)

(By Harold E. Fey)

This is not a propitious time to raise issues which could worsen relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such action could narrow the widening gap between the Russians and the Chinese and push both of them deeper into the Vietnamese war, which already perils world security. But one recalls that since there was never a really propitious time to challenge Nazi Germany, persecutions of the Jews developed into atrocities, then into war and genocide. Later the recollection of silence prolonged too long became a source of shame and regret. Now that measures being taken in Russia against 3 million Jews approach the level of cultural genocide, it is time to protest, whether or not the time is propitious.

Too few Americans are aware that in Russia, government pressure and discrimination has reduced the number of synagogues from 3,000 to fewer than 100. In a number of cities with large Jewish populations no synagogues are left, and Jewish believers are persecuted for attending meetings for worship in homes. And they are victims of many other disabilities Jews have not known on a large scale since Hitler. Identity papers necessary when a person seeks employment, housing, or education or wishes to enter any other important relationship have the word "Jew" written on them, thus opening the way to discrimination.

This designation is used because Jews constitute one of more than 100 subgroups of Soviet society called nationalities. Other groups find designation of nationality status on identity papers an asset; for the Jews it is a liability. When the czarist regime collapsed in 1917, several nationalities tried to gain independence by revolution. To draw them back and hold them within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communists promised that nationalities would enjoy "self-determination of peoples" within the Soviet state, retaining their own languages, schools, newspapers, identities and locations. Jews are identified as a nationality but are denied the privileges accorded that status.

I

This denial violates the Soviet constitution and the stated policy of the Communist Party. Article 123 of the constitution declares that "equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of nationality or race, in all spheres of governmental, cultural, political or other public activity is an in-defeasible law"—a law incapable of being made null and void. This article also states that restriction of rights on account of race or nationality "as well as advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt is punishable by law." As recently as October 1961 the 22d Congress of the ruling and only legal party of the U.S.S.R. declared: "The Communist Party guarantees the complete freedom of each citizen to speak and to rear and educate his children in any language—ruling out all privileges, restrictions or compulsions in the use of this or that language." The Soviet criminal code sustains these positions of constitution and party—in words, but not in practice where Jews are concerned.

Radio Moscow has not failed to make propaganda out of the terms of the nationalities law. One broadcast boasted: "The complete solution of the problem of nationalities and that of the cooperation of nations in the U.S.S.R. is of world historic importance. It is a model for all the peoples who are struggling for their liberation from imperialist aggression." How square such

evidence of self-esteem with the actual situation?

The Jews, 11th largest nationality group in the Soviet Union, are permitted to have no institutions on a national level, as do the Moslems, the Russian Orthodox, Baptist and Armenian churches and the Lutheran churches of Latvia and Estonia. Without help from a central national organization, local Jewish communities are isolated and crushed one by one.

Other nationalities have their own languages recognized, but Hebrew has been a forbidden tongue since 1917. Yiddish, the popular Jewish language, has not been taught in the schools since 1948, yet in the latest census (1959) 472,000 Soviet Jews listed Yiddish as their mother tongue. When the state of Israel was formed, Stalin closed Jewish schools, newspapers, theaters and research institutes. Later some Jews were executed after secret trials for the crime of proposing that Jews be treated as are other nationalities. However, since Stalin's death some momentary relaxations of cultural repressions have been recorded. In 1969 and 1961 six Yiddish classics were published in editions of 30,000 each. A bimonthly Yiddish literary journal has appeared, with a circulation of 25,000; it is expected to become a monthly this year. A Hebrew-Russian dictionary and a book of poems have been published. But all this represents merely a remnant of a once prolific cultural life.

Among the Jewish publications banned is the Hebrew Bible, of which no copies have been printed in Russia since 1917, and no Russian translation has been permitted. Since the 1920's only one press run of 3,000 copies of the Jewish prayer book has been authorized. It is impossible to obtain replacements for equipment, apparel, and foods required by Jewish ritualistic practices. In contrast, the Orthodox and the Baptists have published editions of their Bibles running respectively to 60,000 and 10,000 each, and the Baptists and Lutherans have obtained permission to bring out new hymnals. The Moslems have printed more than 9,000 copies of the Koran in Arabic—a language which is not spoken in the U.S.S.R. but which like Hebrew has liturgical significance. Yet the official reason given for banning publication in Hebrew is that it is not spoken in the country.

Though nearly all of the rabbis, serving the remaining synagogues are in their seventies or eighties, the student body of the one remaining Yeshiva or theological seminary has been limited by state action to only two or three students. The Moslems are allowed to operate institutions for the training of mullahs for their mosques. The Orthodox Church has two academies and three theological seminaries left, although it too has suffered losses (it had eight seminaries in 1959). Estimates are that there is one Baptist preacher for every 500 members and one Orthodox priest for every 1,100—but only one rabbi for every 15,000 to 16,000 Jewish believers. Jews may not be sent abroad for training in the rabbinate, though Moslems and Baptists may and do go abroad for religious training.

II

More than half of the persons executed in recent years in the Soviet Union for so-called "economic crimes" have been Jews. The evidence is strong that in this regard Jews are again being made scapegoats, for such crimes are generally manifestations of the rise of a middle class in Soviet society—a phenomenon which Marx and Lenin did not anticipate or understand and with which the present masters of the Soviet Union are not prepared to cope. Marxist fundamentalists regard the operation of a free market with horror and seek to suppress it as the blackest heresy. Whenever a synagogue is closed the closing is attributed to the economic machinations of Jews who are officers

or members and is accompanied by noisy anti-Semitic propaganda campaigns branding a whole people with suspicion. One wonders what must go through the minds of Soviet leaders who once declared anti-Semitism a crime particularly associated with capitalism as they repeat the charges made so recently by Hitler and move to destroy culturally the very people against whom the German dictator directed his deadly hatred.

To their honor the Jews, who worship God, are not an assimilable element in any totalitarian society. Discovering that fact, as did Hitler less than a generation ago, the Soviet Union turns, as did Hitler, to eliminating them as Jews. The Germans used gas ovens; the U.S.S.R. is pursuing the same end through cultural genocide practiced over a long period. If it succeeds Christians may anticipate that, group by group, their turn will come next.

Statistically—a poor measure in such cases—Russian destruction of the Jews as Jews is about two-thirds complete. Those who break with Judaism, who drop their communal ties with other Jews, who abandon their ties of language and ethnic identity, probably suffer little—except in their souls. They become alienated, uprooted, bereft of their birthright as human beings, accepting the faceless existence which the state decrees. And apparently abandonment, even denunciation, of Judaism does not guarantee first class citizenship; the proportion of Jews in higher education continues to decline, as does the number of those in high posts where security is a factor.

On the basis of the evidence now available, it is apparent that the treatment Jews are receiving in the U.S.S.R. transgresses the official policy on nationalities, even though that policy has been recently reaffirmed by the Communist Party. It violates the Soviet constitution, breaks Soviet criminal law. It contradicts the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the customary standards of civilized states. It is a major survivor of Stalinism in a land where Stalinism has been officially denounced. It continues even though it creates internal disruption, blackens the Soviet name abroad, makes mockery of claims to cultural freedom.

III

In spite of what the Soviet Government proclaims as its policy, the actual policy is to destroy Judaism as a religion, to scatter, demoralize and annihilate a major cultural community, to deprive Jews of their legal status within the Soviet system. By so doing, an officially atheistic state will have demonstrated that it has perfected a pattern of cultural genocide which can be used against other religions when their turn comes.

Some signs, however, indicate that the course may be arrested before it proceeds to its tragic end. Now and again intimations reach the world from the recesses of this closed society that at least some of the Russian people know what is happening and are alarmed by it. Protests from abroad may help increase their disquiet and prevent the total destruction of the second largest Jewish community in the world. The few voices which have been raised in Russia and abroad in behalf of an enlightened public policy and responsible public behavior have not gone unheard. Maurice Friedberg wrote in the January 1965, issue of Commentary that it was world interest that shielded Boris Pasternak from reprisals by the Soviet police; that publicity about cultural deprivation moved the authorities to promise that Sovietish Heimland, the Yiddish cultural journal, would be permitted to increase its frequency of publication to monthly; that foreign concern probably prevented the staging of show trials for alleged Jewish economic offenders

17390

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 23, 1965

and led to a toning down of the blatant anti-Semitism in part of the official press; that charges of religious prejudice in the armed forces caused the government to reveal, nearly 20 years after the event, that more than 100 Jewish soldiers had received Hero of the Soviet Union awards during or after World War II. Expressions of concern do result in some good.

Freedom to worship, to maintain their own identity, to teach their children their own majestic and meaningful history, to speak and teach the language of their fathers, to operate central institutions to serve the needs of all Russian Jews and maintain contacts with coreligionists in the outer world—these aspirations of Soviet Jews are not unreasonable or excessive. The Jews seek no special privilege. They ask only to be accorded the rights possessed by other nationalities. Communist Poland does not interfere with such rights; it even permits Jews to make pilgrimages abroad or to emigrate. Why does great Russia fear to do what a smaller state does with impunity? It would gain, would serve its own best interests, if it would grant the rights due its Jewish citizens, if it put a stop to anti-Semitic bigotry by officials and returned to its early program of campaigning against anti-Semitism in any form.

On the other hand, if the U.S.S.R. persists in official perpetration of outrageous injustice, sooner or later that course will bring its own penalties—first in isolation from the civilized world, eventually in the judgment which no man and no nation, however powerful, can finally evade. Justice will come. This is not a threat; it is an affirmation that there is a moral order in the universe. We hope and pray that the nation which has officially declared war on God is not driven by the death wish implicit in that nihilistic policy to destroy itself, beginning with the Jews.

PRESIDENT ORDERS CONTINUED FIGHT ON OCEAN FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was gratifying to those of us at the Joint Economic Committee who have been concerned over the past 2 years about the existence of discriminatory ocean freight rates to learn of the reappointment of Adm. John Harlee as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. As I have told this body before, Admiral Harlee has been doing a fine, conscientious job, and his reappointment will provide assurance that the Commission will continue to investigate this complicated question of freight rate differentials and their adverse effects upon American exports.

It is deeply gratifying, too, to note that the President has given a clear, resonant mandate to the Maritime Commission to continue its important work on trade barriers that derive from discriminatory ocean freight rates. The President's words add up to very clear sailing orders, and surely we shall have occasion to recall them in the future as we continue our work on this problem.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the President's remarks on freight rate discrimination, excerpted from his July 20 statement at the swearing-in ceremony, be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In all that must be done, the great Maritime Commission has a key role to play—and I am looking to these men to continue to assume that challenge in their leadership at this great Commission.

The Commission has my strongest support for continuing efforts to eliminate all the barriers to U.S. trade now presented by discriminatory freight rates. Likewise, the Commission has my support for its efforts to convince our allied trading partners that we welcome them to our shores to share in the prosperity that our commerce helps create for the free world.

In world trade, this country seeks no special favoritism. But we do seek equality of treatment. We do seek the elimination of unfair or unlawful discriminatory prejudices or predatory practices.

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR ERVIN TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the Raleigh News & Observer on Thursday, July 22, 1965, concerning the endorsement of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., for appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Governor Moore, of North Carolina, has strongly urged the President to appoint my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina, and I wholeheartedly join with him in this endorsement.

There is no man in the United States who is better qualified to serve on the Supreme Court than Senator Ervin. He has unexcelled qualifications in terms of his character, integrity, temperament, and ability. No finer appointment could be made than that of SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ERVIN PLUGGED FOR HIGH COURT BY GOVERNOR MOORE

Governor Moore put in a plug Wednesday for Senator SAM J. ERVIN, of Morganton, as a replacement for Justice Arthur Goldberg on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Moore sent President Johnson a telegram strongly recommending Ervin to the seat vacated Tuesday by Goldberg to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The text of the telegram was released by the office of Governor Moore, who is vacationing out of the State.

"By temperament and experience he is eminently qualified for this position," Moore told the President. "Senator Ervin would acquit himself with distinction and honor on the Nation's Highest Court as he did as a justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court and as he is doing as a U.S. Senator. As Governor of North Carolina, I earnestly request you appoint this distinguished American to the U.S. Supreme Court."

The name of the 58-year-old Ervin has crept into speculation previously regarding a Supreme Court appointment.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, went to bat for Ervin last summer during a western stop by Moore's Democratic campaign caravan.

Moore and Ervin were on the platform as SMATHERS called for the appointment during a rally in Sylva, Moore's long-time home. Ervin's immediate comment was "I don't think we have to worry about that."

Ervin was one of Moore's earliest supporters in the 1964 gubernatorial campaign.

He went to the Senate in 1954 by appointment of the late Gov. William B. Umstead when Senator Clyde R. Hoey died in office. Ervin has had no major opposition winning reelection in 1954, 1956, and 1962.

His career before becoming a Senator included service in the general assembly, on the Burke County and State Democratic executive committees, on the superior court and State supreme court benches, and in Congress from the 10th district in 1946-47.

Ervin graduated from the law schools of the University of North Carolina and Harvard.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: AN ANNIVERSARY TO REMEMBER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1959 the Members of the House and Senate passed a joint resolution, authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

This is the sixth year of that observance. For 6 years the President has been proclaiming Captive Nations Week, and we here in the Senate, and our colleagues in the House, have declaimed against the injustices visited on the captive nations and peoples. Yet basically their status has not changed. They are still captive. I can see the cynics saying now that this is all farcical, that we are paying lip-service to a lost cause.

But Mr. President, the cynics are wrong, as they are so often wrong about so many things. To whom can the captive peoples turn, if not the United States? Since when has this country shrunk from denouncing injustice, simply because that injustice is difficult to rectify? If the subversion and aggression we're fighting in Vietnam are worth the struggle, then certainly the least we can do is to reaffirm, here and now, our commitment to freedom for those earlier captives of communism, the people of the Baltic States, and of the nations of southeastern Europe. In a sense this is a commitment to the people of Russia too, for they were the first to lose their freedom. The point is this: the United States champions the free way of life.

We lead that portion of the world that professes to believe in liberty and the dignity of the individual above all else. Hope is sustained in the hearts of all the millions behind the Iron Curtain because they know that as long as America refuses to accept their servitude as final, it is in fact, not final. There is a chance that they may some day rejoin the brotherhood of free men. But if the United States, by word or deed, sanctions the status quo for the victims of Communist aggression and subversion, then indeed their doom is sealed. Moreover, whatever claim we may have to moral leadership of the free world would be utterly bankrupt.

There is no call here to roll back frontiers. I do not advocate any global crusade against communism. But I do say that America's position, her stance, if you will, matters gravely to those who